REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

At the outset, the Applicant wishes to thank the examiner and his supervisor for the courtesy extended to Applicant's representative during the personal interview conducted on April 27, 2010. The participants were Examiner Anwar, SPE Ferris, and David Ward, Reg. No. 45198. During the interview, the examiner and his supervisor agreed that claims 4 and 7 distinguish over the applied reference. A summary of the substance of the points discussed in the interview are included below.

Claims 4 and 7 stand rejected, under 35 USC §102(e), as being anticipated by Fujino (US 7,319,676). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as follows.

Claim 4 defines a packet communication method that establishes a packet transfer session between an SGSN and a mobile terminal and thereafter transmits information of an internal server access from the mobile terminal to the SGSN via an RNC (see claim 4, section b).

The Final Rejection characterizes Fujino's disclosed RNC address as corresponding to the claimed information of an internal server access (see Final Rejection page 5, lines 2-3). The Final Rejection seems to propose that Fujino discloses transmitting the RNC address from a mobile terminal 19 to an RNC 15, by referencing Fujino's disclosure in column 7, lines 22-32 (see Final Rejection page 5, lines 1-5). Thus, the Final Rejection seems to propose that Fujino discloses the claimed subject matter of transmitting information of an internal server access from a mobile terminal to an RNC.

However, Fujino discloses that such operation occurs before a packet transfer session is established between an SGSN and a mobile terminal (see Fujino col. 7, lines 44-47 and 22-43, where Fujino discloses sending a create PDP context request after transmitting the RNC address). Thus, Fujino seems to disclose the opposite sequence to that recited in claim 4. More specifically, according to the Final Rejection's characterization of Fujino's disclosure, Fujino discloses: (1) transmitting information of an internal server access from a mobile terminal to an RNC and (2) thereafter, establishing a packet transfer session between an SGSN and a mobile terminal, whereas claim 4 recites: (3) establishing a packet transfer session between an SGSN and a mobile terminal and (4) thereafter, transmitting information of an internal server access from the mobile terminal to the SGSN via an RNC.

Accordingly, it was agreed during the interview that Fujino does not identically disclose the Applicant's claimed subject matter and, thus, does not anticipate claim 4 under 35 USC 102. Claim 7 similarly recites the distinguishing subject matter of method claim 4, but with respect to an apparatus. Therefore, allowance of claims 4 and 7 is deemed to be warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Date: May 7, 2010
JEL/DWW/att
Attorney Docket No. 009289-06108
Dickinson Wright PLLC
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 457-0160
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559